



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/043,837	01/09/2002	Yoshio Ikura	MAT-8221US	1180

7590 04/24/2006
RATNER AND PRESTIA
Suite 301
One Westlakes, Berwyn
P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482-0980

EXAMINER

ADHAMI, MOHAMMAD SAJID

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2616

DATE MAILED: 04/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/043,837	Applicant(s) IKURA, YOSHIO	
	Examiner Mohammad S. Adhami	Art Unit 2616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 February 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

- Applicant's Amendment filed 2/21/2006 is acknowledged.
- Claims 1,3, and 8 have been amended.
- Claim 2 has been cancelled
- Claims 1,3-8 are pending

Claim Objections

1. Claim 6 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 6 is shown to depend from claim 2; however, it should depend from claim 1. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
2. Claims 1 and 3-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites "a conversion unit for converting said IP packet to said voice signal and for converting said voice signal." What is the said voice signal converted to?

Claims 3-8 are rejected because they depend from claim 1.

Art Unit: 2616

3. Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In claim 4 the language "an IP address of a call destination from said standard telephone" is unclear. How does a standard telephone give an IP address?

Claim 5 is rejected because it depends from claim 4.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1 and 3-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Itoi (US 6,456,625) in view of Elliot (US 6,754,181).

Re claims 1 and 3 (as best understood):

Itoi discloses "a terminal interface to which a terminal is connected"

(Figure 3B reference number 312 is a terminal interface and reference number 313 is a terminal),

Itoi further discloses "a line interface connected to said network" (Figure 3B reference number 323 is a line interface that connected to network 102).

Itoi further discloses "a communication function unit for controlling a voice signal and an IP packet transmitted through said terminal interface and said line

interface" (Figure 3B reference number 322 and Col.9 lines 10-12 "A call control module 322...controls calls concerning the respective analog telephone sets...and internet phone devices" and Col.9 lines 10-12 *A call control module 322 controls call concerning the analog telephone set and internet phone devices*).

Itoi further discloses "a conversion unit for converting said IP packet to said voice signal and for converting said voice signal" (Figure 3B reference number 309 and Col.9 lines 52-57 "the A/D conversion module 309...executes the analog-to-digital/digital-to-analog conversions of speech signals concerning this analog telephone set...and packet disassembling/assembling processes for digital speech signals").

Itoi further discloses "a connection establishing unit for establishing a connection between said terminal and another terminal connected to said network, by allowing said communication function unit to transmit to said network an IP datagram including an IP address of said concentrator and said IP packet" (Col.9 lines 40-45 "the address unit...automatically gives the data terminal...the set of the local IP address and TCP/UDP port number. As a results, the data terminal...is permitted to join in the LAN...and data communication over the data terminal...is actualized in the LAN").

Itoi does not explicitly disclose "a determining unit for determining whether or not said terminal connected to said terminal interface is capable of an IP communication, wherein...when said determining unit determines that said

terminal is capable of the IP communication, an IP packet input from said line interface is outputted to said terminal interface, and an IP packet input from said terminal interface is outputted to said line interface; and...when said determining unit determines that said terminal is not capable of the IP communication, the IP packet input from said line interface is converted to a voice signal by said conversion unit and outputted to said terminal interface, while said voice signal input from said terminal interface is converted to an IP packet and outputted to said line interface” and “wherein when said terminal connected to said terminal interface is a standard telephone, it is determined that said terminal is not capable of IP communication.

Elliot discloses “a determining unit for determining whether or not said terminal connected to said terminal interface is capable of an IP communication” (Col.89 lines 14-17 “A PC and a telephone is used to receive and make calls. In this case, a user profile will contain information that allows the DAP and Directory Service to make a determination whether to send an incoming call to the PC or to the telephone” where if the call is determined to be sent to a PC it is IP capable and when there is a telephone the terminal is not IP capable).

Elliot further discloses “when said determining unit determines that said terminal is capable of the IP communication, an IP packet input from said line interface is outputted to said terminal interface, and an IP packet input from said terminal interface is outputted to said line interface” (Col.75 lines 53-56 “The

Art Unit: 2616

called user can answer the phone with a mouse click and the calling party then beings sending traffic directly to the IP address of the called party”).

Elliot further discloses “when said determining unit determines that said terminal is not capable of the IP communication, the IP packet input from said line interface is converted to a voice signal by said conversion unit and outputted to said terminal interface, while a voice signal input from said terminal interface is converted to an IP packet and outputted to said line interface” (Col.92 lines 7-11 “the ITG provides services to convert the IP packetized voice from the PC to voice over the PSTN. Similarly, the ITG will take the voice from the PSTN and convert it to the IP packetized voice for the PC”).

Itoi and Elliot are analogous because they both pertain to voice over Internet.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Itoi to include the above discussed limitations in the network as taught by Elliot in order to accommodate IP capable and non-IP capable terminals into a hybrid network and enable determination of each.

Re claim 4 (as best understood):

Itoi discloses “wherein by receiving a dialing of the standard telephone as an IP address of a call destination, the connection to a terminal having the IP address of the call destination is established” (Col. 1 lines 46-50 “a party to be talked to over the internet phone is designated by any of a scheme wherein the LAN address (IP address) and a domain name are used as they are, a scheme

Art Unit: 2616

wherein a number registered and managed on the internet phone side beforehand is dialed” and Col.3 lines 52 –55 “the analog telephone set is permitted to join in the LAN telephone network, and speech over the analog telephone set is actualized in the LAN telephone network).

Re claim 5 (as best understood):

Itoi discloses “when the connection is established, said concentrator transmits the IP datagram including the IP address of said concentrator to the terminal having the IP address of the call destination” (Col.7 lines 51-53 “A common global IP address is a LAN address (IP address) which is given to the LAN telephone switching apparatus”).

Re claim 6:

As discussed above, Itoi meets all the limitations of the parent claims.

Itoi does not explicitly disclose “wherein when said terminal connected to said terminal interface is a computer, it is determined that said terminal is capable of an IP communication.”

Elliot discloses “a determining unit for determining whether or not said terminal connected to said terminal interface is capable of an IP communication” (Col.89 lines 14-17 “A PC and a telephone is used to receive and make calls. In this case, a user profile will contain information that allows the DAP and Directory Service to make a determination whether to send an incoming call to the PC or to the telephone” where if the call is determined to be sent to a PC it is IP capable and when there is a telephone the terminal is not IP capable).

Itoi and Elliot are analogous because they both pertain to voice over Internet.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Itoi to include the above discussed limitations in the network as taught by Elliot in order to incorporate a computer terminal into the hybrid telephony network of Itoi.

Re claim 7:

As discussed above, Itoi meets all the limitations of the parent claims.

Itoi does not explicitly disclose "wherein said concentrator allows an IP datagram transmitted from said computer pass as it is, to a terminal having an IP address designated by said computer."

Elliot further discloses "wherein said concentrator allows an IP datagram transmitted from said computer pass as it is, to a terminal having an IP address designated by said computer" (Col.79 lines 57-58 "no translation of IP encoded voice to PCM is required, indeed the dial out will use TCP/IP over PPP." OR Col.75 lines 53-56 "The called user can answer the phone with a mouse click, and the calling party then begins sending traffic directly to the IP address of the called party").

Itoi and Elliot are analogous because they both pertain to voice over Internet.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Itoi to include the above discussed limitations in the

Art Unit: 2616

network as taught by Elliot in order to incorporate a computer terminal into the hybrid telephony network of Itoi.

6. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Itoi in view of Elliot as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Nadeau (US 6,240,449).

Re claim 8:

As discussed above, Itoi meets all the limitations of the parent claims.

Itoi does not explicitly disclose "wherein when said computer establishes a connection, said concentrator transmits an IP datagram including said IP address which is an IP address of said computer to a said another terminal having said IP address designated by said computer."

Elliot discloses "wherein when said computer establishes a connection, said concentrator transmits an IP datagram including said IP address which is an IP address of said computer to another terminal having said IP address designated by said computer" (Col.93 lines 3-4 "The software package sends a message to a directory service to register the computer" where the message contains 40-43 "The IP address identifying the port that is being used to connect this computer to the network. This address will be used by other IP telephony software packages to establish a connection to this computer.").

Itoi and Elliot are analogous because they both pertain to voice over Internet.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Itoi to include the above discussed limitations in the

network as taught by Elliot in order to incorporate a computer terminal into the hybrid telephony network of Itoi.

Itoi does not explicitly disclose "sending an IP address of said computer to a terminal having the IP address designated by said computer."

Nadeau discloses "sending an IP address of said computer to a terminal having the IP address designated by said computer" (Col.10 lines 45-47 "the solution was for the caller to send an e-mail message to the called party including the caller's own IP address").

Itoi and Nadeau are analogous because they both pertain to voice over internet and communication between a standard telephone and an IP telephone.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Itoi to include sending the caller's IP address to the destination as taught by Nadeau in order to establish a call.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 2/21/2006 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The Remarks concerning the disclosure of Itoi are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

8. Applicant's arguments filed 2/21/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

On pg.6 of the Remarks section of the Amendment filed 2/21/2006, the Applicant contends that Elliot does not determine whether the terminal is a PC or a telephone.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. As cited previously, Col.89 lines 14-17 show determining whether the terminal is a PC or a telephone. The Dap and Directory Service would not be able to correctly route a call if they did not determine whether the terminal was a PC or a telephone.

Elliot further discloses determining whether the terminal is a PC or a telephone on Col.89 lines 47-48 ("A PC to phone call where a directory service is queried to determine that the terminating VNET is a phone").

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Chung (US App. 2003/0002476) shows sending the calling parties IP address to the destination terminal.
10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 2616

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohammad S. Adhami whose telephone number is (571)272-8615. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hassan Kizou can be reached on (571)272-3088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MSA 4/17/2006



HASSAN KIZOU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600